

MINUTES OF THE CITY COUNCIL

CITY OF AUSTIN, TEXAS

Special Meeting

June 29, 1977
1:00 P.M.

Zilker Garden Center

The meeting was called to order with Mayor McClellan presiding.

Roll Call: (Council)

Present: Mayor McClellan, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers
Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Mullen, Trevino

Absent: None

Roll Call: (County)

Present: Travis County Judge Mike Renfro, Travis County Commissioners
Ann Richards, David Samuelson, Bob Honts, Richard Moya

Absent: None

Mayor McClellan stated that this was a called Special Meeting for the purpose of outlining and discussing certain problems which were of mutual concern to the City and County.

Assistant City Manager Jim Miller presented overviews on the following items:

CITY-COUNTY JAIL

I. BACKGROUND:

In 1972 a Federal class action suit against the Travis County jail resulted in a court order demanding certain physical changes in the County jail. Because of the County's lack of funds, many of these changes have still not been made. In 1975 a class action suit over facilities in the City jail caused the City detention facility to be brought up to State standards for short-term detention.

II. CURRENT STATUS:

By 1976, conditions in the County jail had grown so crowded and unsafe that Travis County contracted with the City of Austin to house a limited number of County prisoners in the City jail on a temporary basis. This arrangement, like the County's proposed minimum security facility at Bastrop and the exercise area built recently for County prisoners, represents a short-term solution to a very serious corrections problem.

The National Advisory Commission on Criminal Justice Standards and Goals (Corrections, 1973, Standard 9.1) standardH....local corrections systems...should immediately undertake, on a cooperative basis, planning for community corrections based on a total system concept that encompasses the full range of offenders' needs and the overall goal of crime reduction." A joint City-County correctional facility would be a total "system concept" of corrections. One must consider the duplication of efforts by City and County governments in maintaining two facilities. Also, there is a growing movement in the criminal justice field towards taking the administration of jails out of the hands of the police, whose main responsibility is the reduction of crime.

III. ISSUES:

The primary issue to be addressed is the housing of such a facility. The County jail is clearly inadequate, while the City facility is only adequate for a limited amount of prisoners on a short-term basis.

Funding a new City-County facility is also an issue. A joint bond issue would probably be necessary. Intergovernmental cooperation in funding would have to be worked out. An immediate alternative that may be considered is to let the County take over the City's operations under a contractual arrangement for each City prisoner.

In any case, the issue of correctional system planning must be addressed. Joint City-County jail operations would represent a systems approach to corrections in Travis County. Such an approach would facilitate intercooperation among a variety of social service systems (i.e., health, education, etc.) thereby upgrading the overall quality of corrections in Travis County.

CITY-COUNTY CRIMINAL JUSTICE INFORMATION SYSTEM

I. BACKGROUND:

The traditional division of Criminal Justice responsibility among police, court and correctional agencies, and the fact that jurisdictional boundaries of these agencies are frequently not the same, cause substantial problems in the information transfer among these agencies. These problems effect the collection, storage, dissemination, and retrieval of information concerning persons in the criminal justice system.

The role of a joint Criminal Justice Information System is to alleviate these problems by establishing a system that will transcend agency boundaries. The primary reason for establishing a joint Criminal Justice Information System (CJIS) facility is to meet all system members need for prompt access to data concerning individuals and events using modern computer technology to produce an efficient, integrated system.

The goals of CJIS are: to develop a system with immediate entry, storage and retrieval capability of information critical to the operation and administration of local criminal justice agencies; to avoid duplication of data entry for data needed by more than one agency; to minimize generating costs of making the data available; and to provide a single source for reporting to State and Federal systems. A local CJIS may directly link component systems (police, courts, and corrections) and the coordination of such developing systems is the key to cost-effective solutions.

II. CURRENT STATUS:

In May 1976 negotiations among officials from the City of Austin and Travis County began in an attempt to implement such a system. At the present time no major developments have occurred, principally because an agreement on maintaining a dedicated computer system devoted to Criminal Justice Information cannot be reached. All criminal offender information must be stored in a computer dedicated solely to, and controlled by, criminal justice agencies. The County would like to use the computer for its tax program.

III. ISSUES:

What joint policy decisions must be made to facilitate the development of an integrated City-County criminal justice information system? Who would control the system and how would it be paid for?

FACILITIES FOR COUNTY MEDICAL EXAMINER

I. BACKGROUND:

Travis County Commissioners Court has hired a Medical Examiner, effective June 27, 1977, to provide the necessary medical-legal services to law enforcement and court officials. The need for a full service Medical Examiner's Office (including laboratory and morgue facilities) was documented in a study recently completed by the National Clearinghouse for Criminal Justice Planning and Architecture for Travis and nine other counties. Brackenridge Hospital has been suggested as the possible site for the Medical Examiner's Office.

II. CURRENT STATUS:

Dr. Bucklin, County Medical Examiner, has a small office in the Probate Division at the Courthouse Annex. Chief Frank Dyson has assigned eight homicide detectives duties to include working with Dr. Bucklin. However, morgue, lab and office spaces is not available to begin realizing the full potential of the M. E.'s capabilities.

Building space is available at Brackenridge Hospital but the County may have legal difficulties in making improvements to City-owned property. A local full service Laboratory would require adequate space to house all facilities in a central location. Such a laboratory should receive from all agencies using its services partial annual support based on number of sworn personnel employed by each agency, rather than on a case cost. A staff capable of handling forensic examinations would be required. The processing and analyzing of evidence should be handled within 24 hours of receipt in the laboratory. Highly technical analysis beyond the capabilities of the local laboratory could be forwarded to the State laboratory at DPS.

III. ISSUES:

1. Identify specifically the problem about the County making improvements to City property.
2. Identify the role the City might have in a Medical Examiner's Office.

HEALTH CARE FOR COUNTY PRISONERS

I. BACKGROUND:

When a County Jail inmate requires hospital services at any time, the County physician has direct responsibility to see that this is accomplished. This involves either personal service by the County physician or if some other specialty is required, the County physician securing that service from another physician or surgeon who agrees to assume the responsibility on a referral basis.

Hospital privileges are accorded to the County Physicians so that they may render care with appropriate consultants of their arrangement. The hospital and its emergency room are not considered as referral points when incarcerated prisoners are automatically cared for unless the injury or illness is medically indicated according to the County Physician. Under standing orders dated January 28, 1974, all county jail patients who present themselves to the Emergency Room at Brackenridge Hospital are treated as private no preference patients, unless they are RSS'd to the staff service, or the Travis County Jail Physician, 706 West 19th, decides to treat the patient. In any case, Travis County is responsible for the reimbursement for charges for services rendered. If patients require hospital admission, they may also be admitted in one of three available ways:

- (1) The Travis County Jail Physician, who has admitting privileges, in this case, the patient will be treated as private.

(2) Private, no preference in which case, the Central Texas Medical Foundation physician will contact the Man of the Month for the specific service needed.

(3) RSS'd to the staff service.

In all three cases, Travis County is responsible for reimbursement of charges for services rendered.

When a patient arrives at Brackenridge Hospital for services and it is indicated that Travis County is responsible for the charges, the following steps are taken:

- (1) Admitting personnel of the Emergency Room Business Office personnel contact the Travis County Jail, Medical Section, and secure a control number for verification purposes.
- (2) In addition, the signature of the officer presenting the prisoner for medical attention is obtained.
- (3) Upon completion of the verification process outlined above, the patient is then admitted without a financial class code of "Q" and the Travis County Jail is then entered as the Guarantor of the account. An itemized statement is automatically sent upon dismissal from the hospital.

II. CURRENT STATUS:

While the billing procedures outlined above are seemingly simple and relatively straight forward, the hospital is still experiencing difficulty in securing payment from Travis County for services rendered. Patient accounts back to the years 1974 and 1975 are still unpaid. There remains approximately \$5,700 in accounts with no activity in at least one year and approximately \$160 in the age bracket of 181-360 days. The remaining unpaid accounts are current for the most part and total about \$3,300.

III. ISSUES:

Problems in securing payment from Travis County have existed for several years, and at a glance, appear to revolve around the same accounts. If we can ever reach an agreement on the disposition of these accounts currently outstanding, we will be able to focus our attention on new problems rather than confronting the old ones time and time again.

From a security point of view, Brackenridge Hospital's relationship with the Travis County Jail offers no specific problems in that if the prisoner requiring hospitalization is of a dangerous category, the Sheriff's department always affords Brackenridge Hospital security support by or in the patient's room.

PERSONAL BOND

I. BACKGROUND:

Until recently, on arresting an individual, the Austin Police Officer would have to take the prisoner before a Justice of the Peace for filing a charge and a decision on a personal bond. The City at one time did fund a personal bond program at the Municipal Court but dropped it about 1969-70.

II. CURRENT STATUS:

The County Commissioners Court now provides funds for County employees to spend about 56 hours a week at Police Headquarters and the Municipal Court. Individuals arrested by the Austin Police Department are now filed on before Municipal Court, the County Personal Bondsman interviews the prisoner and takes care of personal bonding situations.

III. ISSUES:

Since individuals arrested by APD, and charged before the Municipal Court, are all going to be prosecuted at the County or District Court level, the main issues are: (1) Who benefits from the personal bond program--the officer who no longer has to find a J.P. and saves his time? The Municipal Judge who does not have to do the interviewing to determine whether a personal bond should be authorized? The J.P. who has been relieved of the workload? and, therefore, (2) Who should pay for the personal bond program--City and/or County?

Assistant City Manager Joe Liro presented an overview on the following item:

CITY-COUNTY CONTRACT FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT
VEHICLE MAINTENANCE SERVICE
(VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT)

History:

In February, 1970, the Vehicle and Equipment Services Department was created and organized for the purpose of assuming responsibility for the total management of the entire vehicle fleet. Included in the responsibilities were police vehicles that previously had been purchased and maintained by the Police Department with no exact or precise program for replacement or maintenance.

Present:

Eighty-one uniform patrol cars along with various CID type vehicles are assigned and maintained from a three-stall facility immediately adjacent to the Police Department. A new facility is under construction north of the Police Department on 5th and West Frontage Road. This facility will provide eight repair stalls, a stall for tire repair, and a stall for lubrication. Four vehicles can be served simultaneously at the new

fuel facility being constructed in conjunction with the garage. This facility was designed in the CIP Program and budgeted in 1975 to support an anticipated five-year normal growth pattern. The police maintenance facility is open 24 hours a day, seven days a week, with generally only limited maintenance performed during the second and third shifts due to the facility shortages and availability of parts.

The Vehicle and Equipment Services Department was established as a working capital agency of the City and the operating revenues thereof, are derived through rental charges to the various departments and/or agencies it services.

Initially, capital outlay for a vehicle is provided by the using department and thereafter, the Vehicle and Equipment Services Department assumes the responsibility through rental charges for the total operation, maintenance, and amortization of such vehicle to affect replacement on a pre-determined life expectancy, which is established and controlled by compiled computer data. For example, the most recent purchase of police patrol cars (81) were 1977 Pontiac LeMans and were purchased at a total cost of \$4,928 each, with such purchase effected from replacement funds that were set aside from vehicle rental charges to the Police Department and therefore, required no capital outlay or appropriation as such by the department.

The rental rates established under this procedure for the 77-78 fiscal year are .299 with a minimum mileage charge of 3,000 miles per month which results in an average cost for the total patrol fleet of \$943 per month per vehicle. This charge, of course, includes total maintenance, fuel, accident repair, and replacement based on the established life expectancy of 18 months. Communications equipment, of course, are treated separately and distinctively from the patrol car and the cost thereof, are not included in the basic vehicle rental rate.

Issues/Options:

Mr. Lester L. Rogers is the Departmental Director and there is no known county counterpart for this position. Certain services could be provided for the Sheriff's Department, such as acquisition of vehicles along with City purchases that possibly would result in a significant cost savings through standardized and competitive specifications and purchase of a greater number of vehicles at one time.

Certain maintenance support could not be provided under any circumstances at the present unless such service were totally contracted to an outside commercial facility due to the above mentioned inadequate City facility.

Upon completion of construction of the new repair facility approximately May, 1978, service could possibly be provided, however, such service would generally distract from the City's ability to support it's own police fleet. In order for the Vehicle and Equipment Services Department to provide total support for the Sheriff's Department vehicles, (approximately 30), additional personnel would be essential and space added to the police garage in the form of two additional stalls. It should be pointed out that purchases of all sedans, both administrative and police type, are consolidated in one annual purchase and therefore, any

agreement or contract with the County should stipulate this condition. Also, spare cars must also be purchased at this time since an accident that results in a total loss to the vehicle does not effect the annual schedule buy.

Deputy City Manager Homer Reed presented an overview on the following item:

HOSPITAL AND OUTPATIENT HEALTH CARE FOR INDIGENTS

Hospital and outpatient health care for indigents in Austin and Travis County is provided by Brackenridge Hospital, the Austin-Travis County Health Department and a Mobile Health Van which operates in Travis County outside the City limits. During the most recently completed fiscal year, costs of these services were shared by City, County and federal governments as follows:

	<u>Federal</u>	<u>City</u>	<u>County</u>
Brackenridge Hospital (Inpatient and Outpatient care for Indigent)		\$6,587,237	
Health Department (Outpatient Care for Indigent)	\$927,449	175,000 Est.	
Mobile Van			\$87,109 Est.
TOTAL	\$927,449	\$6,762,237	\$87,109

Brackenridge Hospital was founded in 1884 as a City-County institution. The original construction was financed with 50/50 participation by the City of Austin and Travis County. Both the City and the County contributed to the cost of indigent medical care through the mid 1950's. Since that time Brackenridge Hospital has been a City institution with all costs for treating indigent patients borne by the City. Indigent patients who reside in Travis County but outside the City limits receive the same quality of care and the same financial support as that provided to indigents who reside within the City limits.

The Austin-Travis County Health Department began in 1972 to operate outpatient clinics as a part of the Model Cities Program. Subsequently, the department assumed responsibility for the Rosewood Clinic which was initially created under the guidance of the Human Opportunities Corporation. Today, clinics which are fully staffed with physicians and necessary support personnel are operated in the Model Cities Service Center at 6th and Comal streets and in the Rosewood-Zaragosa Center at Webberville and Pleasant Valley Roads. In addition, part-time clinics are provided in the Mt. John's area and in South Austin. A separate dental clinic is maintained, the cost of which is not included in the figures quoted above.

An extensive study is now underway to evaluate health care delivery systems. Five study teams involving extensive citizen participation are developing a recommended health care system which will seek to accomplish the following:

1. Emphasize the delivery of preventive and ambulatory health services,
2. Provide financial assistance in a manner which promotes the efficiency of operation,
3. Emphasize the private sector delivery of health services, especially as related to the provision of highly specialized care,
4. Emphasize private practice medical professional coverage utilizing graduate medical programs as required to provide physician services for non-preference patients,
5. Provide support for the physical health maintenance of the economically disadvantaged citizens of Austin to include general medical and surgical care provided in both inpatient and outpatient settings.

Objective number 2 above could lead to a recommendation that the provision of financial assistance to the indigent be separated from the budget from Brackenridge Hospital. Payment for medical care for the indigent could then be made to any institution which renders the care to a resident who has been certified to be eligible for such assistance. This would make it possible for Brackenridge Hospital to be financially independent with no "bottom-line" subsidization by the City. When hospital finances are restructured in this way, it would be possible for Brackenridge to be operated by a non-profit corporation or some other non-City agency. Such restructuring would eliminate any City responsibility for reimbursing Brackenridge or other hospitals for medical care provided to persons who are not residents of the City of Austin.

It should be noted that a recommended health care system has not yet been developed by the study teams participating in the Health Systems Study. The preceding comments are offered only as indications of the need for further City-County cooperation in this area.

Assistant City Manager Jim Miller presented an overview on the following item:

MENTAL HEALTH/MENTAL RETARDATION

I. BACKGROUND:

The Austin-Travis County MH/MR was created in accordance with Article 5547-203 of Vernon's Civil Statutes, as passed in 1965. The City of Austin, A.I.S.D., Travis County and the University of Texas contracted with each other and jointly appointing a Board of Directors to establish and operate a MH/MR Community Center. However, funds for the MH/MR program are primarily provided by the City and Travis County.

II. CURRENT STATUS:

Under the amended MH/MR Act, one governmental body may establish an MH/MR Center, or, two or more may contract with each other to create a Center. The divided appointment responsibilities to the MH/MR Board by the four founding entities gives little incentive to any one government body to adequately monitor and assist the program. Citizens on Advisory Boards to the neighborhood Human Development Centers often come to City Council for decision when not certain about the final decision point in the MH/MR Center.

III. ISSUES:

Should the current four-party contract creating the MH/MR Center be re-negotiated so that one government is the organizing and appointing authority?

Should all four of the original organizers of the MH/MR Centers provide funding on an equal basis? If not, how?

Assistant City Manager Andreea Beatty presented an overview on the following item:

EMS COOPERATION WITH TRAVIS COUNTY

History

On January 1, 1976, the City of Austin began operating an Emergency Medical Services System within the City limits of Austin. The City purchased the franchise for ambulance service from Austin Ambulance Service. Austin Ambulance Service provided ambulance coverage to Travis County under a contract which expired on December 31, 1975. With the expiration of this contract, the County could have continued to be serviced by several other ambulance carriers operating in the County, but sought an alternative for the provision of emergency medical services. As a result, in January 1976, Travis County entered into a contract with the City of Austin for the provision of emergency medical services to County residents. The initial contract called for the County to pay the City a flat fee and mileage charge for each EMS run in the County. In July 1976, the County entered into another contract for ambulance service with Capital Ambulance Company. This contract called for Capital Ambulance to be the primary responder to medical emergency calls in the County with the City of Austin, through the EMS Department, coordinating their activities and providing backup service as needed.

Additionally, an Emergency Medical Technician Volunteer Training Program was initiated. The objective of this volunteer program was to provide trained personnel on the scene for stabilization of the injured while awaiting the arrival of an EMS unit. To date, five (5) EMT schools have been conducted, training a total of 90 County volunteers.

Present Status

In April, 1977, Capital Ambulance Company withdrew as primary responder to emergency calls in Travis County because they were not granted an increase in their fee. As a result, the County requested a proposal from the City of Austin for full emergency coverage for Travis County. The existing contract with the City of Austin and Travis County was amended to provide for full emergency coverage and a reasonable reimbursement for the cost of operating such a service. Specifically, an EMS unit manned with the same type of equipment and personnel as the EMS units covering the City would be stationed in the County and the emergency units stationed in the City would provide backup service. The County would reimburse the City a monthly fee of \$12,000, to be adjusted according to a formula.

Issues

Future issues between Austin and Travis County will be:

1. The continuation of training for County volunteers, plus additional training to the paramedic level for those volunteers already trained at the basic level. This will be accomplished through a training grant from the Department of Health, Education and Welfare.
2. A monitoring of costs to assure adequate reimbursement to the City for the expenditure of providing emergency medical services to the County.
3. The role of private providers in supplying emergency medical services in the County.
4. A cooperative effort to establish the feasibility of a City/County contract with the National Guard for helicopter EMS assistance.

Assistant City Manager Joe Liro presented an overview on the following item:

SOLID WASTE DISPOSAL

BACKGROUND:

Sanitary landfilling is the exclusive means of solid waste disposal in Austin and Travis County. The County operates two landfills and a transfer station, but does not provide collection services. The City operates a landfill and provides residential collection service within the City.

The City and County have worked cooperatively in providing solid waste services. City trucks use the sanitary landfill leased and operated by the County; county residents use the City's southeast facility. In 1976 the City and County cooperated in seeking a new northeast landfill site. This effort resulted in the selection of a new site for the northeast part of Travis County, but no action has been taken on this recommendation.

The City has evaluated independently two sites in the northeast but no action has been taken on this recommendation either.

PRESENT OPERATIONS

Three sanitary landfills and one transfer station currently operate in Travis County.

1. The County operates two landfills, one on Highway 290 East, the other, a small landfill near Highway 1431 in northwest Travis County, and a transfer station near Lakeway.
2. A private facility operates adjacent to the County site on Highway 290 East.
3. The City operates a facility on Farm Road 812 south of Bergstrom Airforce Base.

These sites have a relatively short remaining life-span. The County facility on 290 East may be complete by 1979; the City facility will be complete by 1983.

Continued growth patterns and increasing growth in the volume of solid waste indicate that the City and County should now be considering future site locations for use beginning in 1979 and 1983.

A recent study suggests that the City and County have no economically viable alternative to landfills. Other methods are untested and cost more than landfilling. In addition, federal policy encourages the use of sanitary landfills as the primary means of solid waste disposal.

ISSUE/OPTION

The major issue facing the City and County is the location of one or more new sanitary landfill sites.

Selection of a new site or sites could be an area in which the Commissioners Court and the City Council could cooperate effectively. Future Council-Court deliberations could center on:

1. Travis County assuming responsibility for locating and securing future sites;
2. Joint selection of future sites; and
3. A City-County agreement to assure that landfill site acquisition costs are distributed according to utilization.

Assistant City Manager Andrea Beatty presented an overview on the following items:

COUNTY PARTICIPATION IN THE AUSTIN-TRAVIS COUNTY HEALTH DEPARTMENTHistory

The County has participated financially in the operation of the Austin-Travis County Health Department since September 1, 1938. At that time, an agreement was entered into by the City of Austin, the State of Texas, and Travis County.

This agreement has been renewed annually to the present. The County fiscal year is January-December and each year the Health Department submits a requested annual operating budget which is reviewed by the Commissioner's Court. After the Commissioner's Court approves the budget, the Director of the Health Department administers the budget for the Health Department.

Present Status

Presently, the County is contributing \$388,714 to the operation of the Health Department. This represents approximately 5% of the total Health Department budget for FY 76-77. These funds provide supplies and salaries for 17 employees who provide these services in the following areas:

Environmental Health Division--1 Environmental Health Specialist,
4 Sanitarians, 2 Vector Controllers

Annually, the employees in this division perform approximately 3,000 septic tank inspections, 1,000 restaurant inspections, and resolve a limited number of dumping complaints. Also, approximately 85,000 acres will be sprayed for mosquitoes this year in the county.

Health Action Division--2 Public Health Aides

The Public Health Aides assist in Well Child Conferences and the Department's tuberculosis program. There are currently six Travis County residents under treatment for TB.

Personal Health Services--1 Nurse Supervisor, 4 Public Health Nurses

The Nurse Supervisor works primarily in coordinating communicable disease epidemiology for the city and county. The Public Health Nurses perform generalized public health nursing functions for residents of the county. These functions include communicable disease investigation and control, conducting well child conferences and home visits for the prevention of illness and promotion of health. Approximately 2,800 home nursing visits are projected for FY 77.

This division also provides on a referral basis occupational therapy and physical therapy services to residents of Travis County. Immunization and Health Card Clinics are available to residents of Travis County at 2334 Rosewood. There are also three clerical employees paid by the County. One of these employees serves as the department's switchboard operator. The other two provide clerical support for nurses and sanitarians.

Included in the \$388,714 are funds to operate the Mobile Health Van currently at an annual cost of \$87,109 which provides for general medicine, obstetrical, family planning and immunization services for residents of rural Travis County. Approximately 6,000 patient visits are made each year to the Mobile Health Van. Also, the Mobile Health Van physician attends the sick and injured inmates at the Travis County jail.

Issues

The issues as we see them include the following:

1. A need exists for dental services for county residents. In the past dental referrals were made from the Mobile Health Van to the Austin Dental Clinic. The county discontinued this service two years ago.
2. A need exists for a county-wide septic tank inspection program. Currently, the Austin-Travis County Health Department has not control over septic system development in areas of Travis County not covered by ETJ (extraterritorial jurisdiction) or where the City of Austin provides utilities.
3. A need exists for a county-wide solid waste disposal program. Due to the rapid growth of the county, it is necessary that an organized solid waste disposal program be developed to meet the increased demand for services.
4. A review of the volume of services provided to County residents is being undertaken to assure that Travis County is providing sufficient funding to cover these costs. County residents currently have access to all programs provided by the Health Department.

911 SYSTEM

HISTORY

In 1972, the subject of a "911" telephone system for emergency services was first discussed. It was proposed by the Capital Area Planning Council (CAPCO) as a part of a grant for a regional Emergency Medical Services System. This system would have encompassed a 10-county region and required the involvement not only of various political jurisdictions but also telephone companies other than Southwestern Bell. The grant for the regional EMS System was not received, and the project was abandoned.

PRESENT

In response to a request from Councilman Ron Hullen, a preliminary study has been undertaken by the City of Austin regarding a "911" Communication System. The emergency departments of the City of Austin and Southwestern Bell Telephone Company are interested in exploring the potential for establishing such a system. Lead time is approximately twenty-four months from the time and order for such a system is placed with Southwestern Bell.

It has been recommended by the telephone company that the project be undertaken in the metropolitan exchange area which includes Austin-Travis County and several other surrounding counties. This would minimize the number of jurisdictions whose initial cooperation must be obtained, while making a clear and simple emergency telephone number to all subscribers in the Austin telephone directory.

Specific costs for implementing the "911" system are not known at this time, and will vary according to decisions which are reached about the kind of system to be designed. However, it appears that Southwestern Bell will bear the major portion of the "front end" costs for equipment, while the subscriber will face additional monthly service charges which may range from \$2,000 to \$9,000. These costs, of course, would be distributed among all political subdivisions participating in the system.

FUTURE

The following issues must be addressed if the decision is reached to pursue the 911 system:

1. Service area: Austin, Travis County, Metropolitan Austin telephone exchange, ten county area.
2. Plan for enlisting support of all appropriate jurisdictions and agencies.
3. Cost allocation System.
4. Federal fund availability.
5. Physical/organizational changes and improvements.

Assistant City Manager Joe Liro presented overviews on the following items:

COOPERATIVE PURCHASING

History of County/City Purchasing

The City of Austin centralized its purchasing and stores function in 1971. Material shortages and rapidly escalating prices were two of the reasons for this step; another was the historical record that centralized purchasing produces savings of up to 15 percent.

During the past few years, the City has cooperated informally with the County Auditor by exchanging bid invitation data and specification information. Cooperative purchasing has been discussed; however, there is no record of the City or the County engaging in any such endeavor.

Cooperative purchasing between governmental jurisdictions is now in effect in other areas in the nation. In Texas, cooperative purchasing has had legal status for over twenty-five years. Tarrant County, the City of San Antonio, Harris County School District are three larger jurisdictions which have cooperative purchasing arrangements with nearby municipalities and school districts.

Current Status of County/City Purchasing

Travis County does not have a centralized purchasing entity, except for the issuance of certain bid invitations. The City of Austin has centralized its purchasing activities for equipment, materials, and services. Under the City's centralized purchasing concept, vehicles and

equipment are purchased on an "annual buy schedule." Major vehicles and equipment are purchased in accordance with this schedule, enabling the coordination of a year's requirements into one or two bid invitations.

Options Available in County/City Purchasing

The City of Austin and Travis County have several options available in the cooperative purchasing of equipment and materials;

1. The City can provide to the County equipment and materials specifications for use in bid invitations issued and awards made by the County.
2. The City and County jointly could request bids from supplies for certain items and place their contracts either jointly or independently with the best bidder.
3. "Piggy-back Procedure." This procedure has two basic approaches as follows:
 - a. The City of Austin merely includes in its supply agreements that Travis County would have the option to purchase the materials listed in the agreement at the same price available to the City. A disadvantage to this approach is that Travis County may not necessarily use the same materials and making it optional with the County with no estimate provided probably would not result in the lowest and best price that could be secured. This is in effect a cooperative purchasing arrangement.
 - by. This approach is similar to the above with the exception that the County and City both provide estimated quantities for specific materials and establish a supply agreement which is explained below. This in effect is a cooperative purchasing arrangement. The jurisdiction issuing the bid invitation should be the one with the largest purchase volume, probably the City of Austin in most cases.

There are many advantages to both jurisdictions in the approach suggested by option 3b. Annual buys and supply agreements can be utilized to achieve this. A supply agreement could be issued for a specific time period, covering similar commodities. It would require the City and County to purchase only actual needs. Purchase releases against the agreement would be made directly to the supplier by the respective jurisdictions.

Any County/City purchase would be substantial and provide generally lower commodity pricing to both jurisdictions. High dollar value commodities such as the following represent the greatest opportunity for savings:

Anti-freeze	Dairy Products	Office Supplies
Auto Batteries	Fuels	Traffic Control Paint
Auto Parts	Incandescent & Fluorescent	Traffic Control Sign
Concrete Pipe	Lamps	Materials
Construction	Lubricants	Vehicles & Equipment
Materials	Medical & Drug Supplies	

SOCIAL SERVICES GRANTS

I. HISTORY

Prior to 1964, the approach of the federal government to the provision of social services was to either provide the service directly -- e.g., Social Security, Unemployment Insurance -- or provide funding to another level of government to operate social services programs. Beginning in 1964, changing federal attitudes toward social services resulted in the direct provision of federal categorical grants to non-governmental and para-governmental agencies, resulting in a significant change in the attitudes of both the providers and consumers of social services toward government as the guarantor of social service funding. Then in the early 1970's the institution of Federalism policies was evidenced by a shift away from categorical grants toward block grants, with few strings attached, made again directly to units of government. This move essentially severed many of the federal government's funding ties with those social service providers who had become its dependents; these providers then tended to seek support from units of local government, and were frequently successful, as in the case of both the City of Austin and Travis County, each of which now funds numerous such agencies.

II. STATUS

At the time that rising expectations have placed greater and greater demands upon local government for the funding of social service agencies, the growth of the revenues upon which local government depends has slowed significantly because of the national economic situation. Nevertheless, during this same time period, local government support of social services has tended to increase at a higher rate than have either its revenues or its expenditures for other types of services. For the City of Austin, allocations to social service agencies have increased from approximately \$750,000 in fiscal 1975 to approximately \$1.5 million dollars in fiscal 1977; however, revenues during this same period have increased by only 27%. The situation of the County is not dissimilar to that of the City. The current allocation for contract services exceeds \$300,000.

The City and the County have already taken some steps toward the coordination of decision-making with regard to social service contract agencies. Both require applicant agencies to use the same application packages; review of these applications has been coordinated despite the different fiscal years of the City and the County. The Human Services Review Team, established by resolution of both the City Council and the Commissioners' Court, conducts a coordinated review of the grant applications received by both the City and the County and submits its funding recommendations to the City Council and to the Commissioners' Court. Nevertheless, the fact remains that the City-County approach to the funding of local social service providers is a reactive approach.

III. OPTIONS

There are certain methods which could be employed to make more effective use of our mutual resources in the provision of social services, among which are the following:

A. Consolidate the Process for Making Application for Funding.

1. While the use of a single application for both City and County funding would not impact upon our respective financial situations, it could lead to the more effective use of the time of both our respective staff and staff of the agencies. This principle could be expended to include both contract monitoring and evaluation as well.

B. Joint Funding of Social Service Agencies.

1. Currently the actual funding decisions of both the City and the County are made separately. Consolidation of the decision-making process could result in more effective funding decisions. This might be accomplished in several ways:
 - a. Joint City Council-Commissioners' Court meetings to decide funding allocations, perhaps utilizing a pooling arrangement of monies available for the funding of social services;
 - b. Mutual delegation to a third party, e.g. Community Council, of the decision-making authority regarding the allocation of funds determined to be available.
 - c. Modification of the present system of making direct grants to agencies to include the establishment of firm funding guidelines, the incorporation of the aforementioned single application approach, and a method for dividing applications received between the City and the County.

C. Targeted Funding and Request for Proposal

1. Joint or respective determination of City Council-Commissioners' Court priorities prior to the consideration of applications could ensure more detailed consideration of those applications which are addressed to the accomplishment of stated priorities. This could also serve to limit the types of applications currently being received and reviewed by our respective staff. If done early enough, it could also allow for staff development of specifications for programs designed to address those priorities, which could then be used for the solicitation of particular kinds of programs designed to meet particular kinds of needs. Through increasing the focus on programs, it could also serve to break down the distinction that currently exists between funding provided to departments and funding provided to contract agencies.
2. More extensive use of item vetos by decision-makers could permit more precise tailoring of programs funded to match the desires of the decision-makers.

D. Increase the use of Federal Funding for Social Services.

1. More aggressive pursuit of non-local funds could result in the availability of more funds for social services, perhaps easing the drain on local funds; however, care must be taken to avoid the creation of a demand which would later have to be satisfied from local resources. The importance of this consideration cannot be overstated due to the uncertainty and instability of continued federal funding.
2. Combined pursuit, administration, and utilization of non-local resources could result in the securing of funds not otherwise available, while at the same time perhaps reducing the costs of administering these grants.

Because the options presented above are not mutually exclusive, it is apparent that there are many ways in which the City and the County can mutually and/or individually act to improve the use of public monies for the provision of social services.

COMMUNITY SERVICES ADMINISTRATION
COMMUNITY ACTION PROGRAM

I. HISTORY

In February, 1973, the City exercised local government options under the "Green" Amendments (1967) to the "Economic Opportunity Act of 1964" (ECA) and absorbed the Human Opportunities Corporation of Austin (HOC). HOC was a private non-profit corporation that functioned as the Austin-Travis County Community Action Agency. Upon its absorption, the City became the grantee for the CAP and began operating the four rural and six urban neighborhood centers and attendant CAP programs.

Beginning in 1972, all CAP's experienced funding problems; President Nixon attempted to dismantle the Office of Economic Opportunity (OEO), and CAP operated through April, 1975 on quarterly funding authorized by continuing resolutions of Congress. The "Community Services Act of 1974" created the Community Services Administration (CSA, successor to OEO) and eventually enabled stabilized funding.

However, the program under CSA received lower levels of funding than it had under OEO, and in 1975 CSA prevented CAP agencies from re-programming carry-over funds that had accumulated due to the uncertainties of the preceding 2-1/2 years. Thus, the Austin-Travis County grant is stable at \$420,000 per year. During this period the matching requirement has increased from 50-20 in 1973 to 60-40 at the present time (and it will continue to even out; by FY '79 it will be 50-50).

In 1975, Travis County requested that the City investigate the feasibility of the County operating the rural centers. Commissioner Moya noted that the responsibility would probably fall on the Commissioners' Court sooner or later. The City accordingly delegated the rural center program to the County in 1975.

II. STATUS

The City presently operates six neighborhood centers out of seven facilities (Rosewood-Zaragosa is a satellite of the Rosewood Center). The City also operates several health and nutrition-related programs that were originally implemented by HOC. Travis County operates four rural centers, a mobile health van in the rural area, the van having been purchased with Model Cities funds for the purpose of a satellite clinic in the Montopolis area.

Travis County receives 18% of the federal funds. At the time of delegation this amount represented sufficient monies to fund the existing staff and level of support. Because the federal funds have remained stable since 1975 (\$420,000 annually), the amount has not changed. Therefore, whenever the program has required additional staff or support, it has come from local sources or from CETA sources. There is some possibility of additional federal funds for this program but still not definite.

III. OPTIONS

- A. The creation of another independent corporation to operate the Community Action Program (CAP).
 - 1. This option would not necessarily save money; as the matching requirement increases so probably would demands on local government. However, local government could set a ceiling on the funding which would be available for the CAA.
 - 2. The CAA would have to seek other sources for the remaining required in-kind.
- B. The County could operate the rural and urban portion of the program.*

County costs are likely to increase even if the City continued to provide the existing level of cash match (currently \$100,000). The reasons for this is that the fiscal and program monitoring, planning and evaluation functions have been absorbed by other City staff, but the County would have to provide for these functions anew.

*There is doubt that the City could operate the rural program. The increased matching requirement precludes sole reliance on in-kind contribution, while state law prevents the City from expending local revenue outside the City limits. Therefore, any increase in services or resources for the rural area, the City would be forced to ask for it from the County.

- C. The program can continue as presently structured.
 - 1. For the rural centers to operate at a level comparable to the urban centers, Travis County will likely have to contribute more local funds to the program or attempt to secure supplemental funding from non-local sources.

2. The effectiveness of the rural program could increase through the utilization of CETA resources as a complement to other federal and increased local contributions.
3. Integration of City and County planning, purchasing and transportation for the program could improve the efficiency and perhaps the effectiveness of program service delivery through the elimination of duplicated and/or fragmented resource utilization.
4. Planning for program integration that results in the development of services and resources that complement rather than compete with urban and rural needs could forestall disputes concerning the allocations of funds and other contributions.

Assistant City Manager Jim Miller presented an overview on the following item:

PARKS AND RECREATION

I. BACKGROUND:

In recent years, a number of discussions have been held on parks and recreation programs co-sponsored by the City and County. These discussions have included playground programs at school sites in the County park sites for acquisition, and/or development and management.

II. CURRENT STATUS:

No discussions are occurring at the present time, either on an overall cooperative basis or on individual projects. The City, however, is providing federal funds to the County for a Summer Youth Recreation Support Program as part of the Community Action Program.

III. ISSUES:

1. Should there be joint planning of City-County parks? If so, how? City-County Parks and Recreation Board? Purpose of such a Board?
2. Acquisition, development and operations of Parks and Recreation facilities to meet the leisure time needs of City and County residents. Where does the responsibility lie? Should County operate parks within the City? If no, when annexed will City reimburse County for site and improvements? If yes, on what basis?
3. Feasibility of establishment of County Parks and Recreation Department versus contracting with City of Austin for operation?

Deputy City Manager Homer Reed presented an overview on the following item:

AUSTIN TRANSPORTATION STUDY

Since 1962, the City of Austin and Travis County have been involved in a cooperative transportation planning program with the Texas Highway Department. In 1965, the Austin Transportation Plan - 1962-1982 was published. Based on that plan, the Austin City Council approved an expressway and major arterial street plan which has been in effect since 1969.

In 1974, a joint agreement was entered into by the City, County and State Highway Department for the purpose of updating the Transportation Plan and establishing a continuing transportation planning process. A study office was organized and was staffed with City, County, and State highway personnel. The study director is designated by the State Highway Department. Soon after the Austin Transportation Study was created, a new federal regulation required that all street, highway and transportation projects must be reviewed by a "metropolitan planning organization" in order to qualify for federal funds. The Metropolitan Planning Organization (MPO) is designated by the Governor upon the recommendation of the City and County. In some areas the Council of Governments was designated as the MPO and in others the central city was given the MPO designation. In Austin, the steering committee was first designated and, more recently, the policy advisory committee for the Austin Transportation Study was designated the metropolitan planning organization. As a result, the original long range planning purpose of the Austin Transportation Study has been modified to include long range planning, current planning and at least some oversight of project implementation. This has delayed production of meaningful planning documents for the use of member governmental agencies.

Currently, the 1969 expressway and major arterial street plan is still being utilized since a long range transportation plan for the Austin area has not yet been produced by the Austin Transportation Study. Developing a traditional transportation plan based on current technical data seems to indicate a conflict with the expressed goal of Austin citizens favoring a multi-modal transportation system with emphasis on mass transit systems. While no formal action has been taken, a consensus appears to be developing in the Austin Transportation study which favors development of a transportation plan which is multi-modal and which calls both for the continued development of streets and traffic arteries as well as increasing emphasis on mass transit.

Strong leadership is needed by the City of Austin and Travis County in conjunction with the State Department of Highways and Public Transportation to focus these transportation planning efforts and produce a comprehensive transportation plan to aid in guiding the development of Austin and Travis County now and in future years.

Assistant City Manager Jim Miller presented an overview on the following item:

PLANNING CONTROLS IN E.T.J.

I. BACKGROUND

Until recent years, there was a minimum of contact between the city and county on joint planning efforts. On occasion, a member of the Planning staff would appear to present information for an item on the County Commissioner's agenda. The only staff member with which contact was made was the County Engineer in relation, generally, to subdivision activity.

II. CURRENT STATUS

With the election of Judge Renfro and Commissioner Honts and later Commissioner Richards, however, the pace of direct contact work picked up significantly. Shortly after their election and continuing for several months, members of the Planning staff were invited to sit in on the Court's work sessions regarding ETJ and subdivision activity. The Court hired a new County Engineer, a Hydrologist, and a Planner. As a result, the County's review of subdivision platting has increased by the Court requiring their approval before a subdivision could be recorded and their staff requiring County standards in our ETJ. This increased activity has added several weeks to the subdivision review process.

III. ISSUES

Examples of several issues which need resolution include:

1. Development standards in the ETJ and in areas outside the ETJ.
2. Facilitating the subdivision review time by all public agencies.
3. Strengthening septic tank standards.
4. Development of compatible flood plain management program and ordinances.
5. Opening lines of communication between City and County government; and
6. Establishing a procedure for dedication and vacation of streets in the County within the ETJ.

The necessary work to resolve these issues might include:

1. Publication of a manual showing all City and County development standards applicable in Travis County, both in and outside the City's ETJ
2. Encouraging County participation in the subdivision process concurrent with City departments rather than at the end of the process in order to decrease total review time.

3. Working with State Department of Health and City/County Health Department to strengthen the 1972 septic tank ordinance.
4. Making flood plain management part of the manual identified in Item 1. above; and
5. Keeping each governmental unit informed on a regular basis of work anticipated, or being done, in areas of joint interest, such as pending annexation by the City.

COORDINATION OF POLLING PLACES

Judge Renfro stated that the County hoped that with some coordination common polling places could be used for both City and County elections.

LIBRARY

Councilmember Himmelblau requested and it was agreed that in future meetings library services and bookmobiles be included in the discussions.

CITY-COUNTY JAIL

Discussion was then held on the City-County jail problem. Judge Renfro preferred to see the City and County work toward a joint facility. It could be done on a contractual basis or by a sharing of facilities. Mayor McClellan felt that there was a sentiment to share a facility, but there probably was not a consensus as to how to approach the problem. She favored a contractual arrangement. She wanted to see a timetable set up which was in keeping with the County's needs. Information could be collected through a committee and/or assign staff and come back collectively. Councilmember Trevino favored the committee approach, but staff assistance could also be used. He felt that the Council was interested in getting out of the jail business as quickly as possible.

Commissioner Hontz felt that the County probably should assume primary responsibility for the jail. He suggested that a task force evaluate a County jail which would build capacity for the City on a long term contractual basis. He urged that Mayor McClellan and Judge Renfro appoint within the next 48 hours representatives from the Council and Commissioners' Court to work with staff to try and reach an agreement. He felt that a cost basis and formula similar to the existing EMS contract could be worked out. The County needed to know the City's position before meeting with surrounding counties to discuss a regional jail.

Commissioner Richards asked how a joint bond issue could be done to finance the jail. City Manager Davidson said that the item was included for discussion, but that he would not recommend that approach. He agreed that one entity should finance and operate the jail and contract with the other entity for services.

Mayor McClellan stated that she would appoint the City's portion of the task force and a decision would be reached within two weeks. There was brief discussion as to the location of the new jail, and Mayor McClellan said that the location would be part of the task force report.

MENTAL HEALTH/MENTAL RETARDATION

Councilmember Himmelblau felt that MHMR needed to be discussed before Budget time and that a task force also be appointed.

Commissioner Richards wondered why, if a legal contract had never been struck, it was necessary to bring together all of the existing entities which were part of MHMR. She thought it might be more productive to explore which entities wanted to continue and enter into a contract with MHMR.

City Attorney Jerry Harris stated that The University of Texas was not one of the entities authorized by State law to contract for the formation of MHMR. No written contract had ever been found relating to the creation of the local MHMR. The existing entities which wanted to continue could get together and write a contract to continue MHMR. Councilmember Himmelblau said that the City and County were unhappy because they had no control over the appointed MHMR Board. She wanted to see the articles rewritten to make the MHMR Board an advisory board to the Commissioners Court and the City Council. The University of Texas should be asked to withdraw.

Mayor McClellan said that a task force would be set up and report back in four weeks.

PERSONAL BOND

Commissioner Moya stated that the County and City presently were working together on the personal bond program, but that some space was needed to conduct interviews with persons who were booked. He felt that the interviews should be part of the booking process. Mayor McClellan stated that the problem could be worked on administratively and should not take too long.

HOSPITAL AND OUT-PATIENT HEALTH CARE FOR INDIGENTS

Councilmember Trevino stated that it was the consensus of Study Team #1 that the City provide indigent care only for residents of Austin. If the Council concurred with that recommendation, then the County needed to know so that it could arrange for indigents in Travis County but outside Austin city limits. Councilman Cooke asked if there were other team studies being made which indicated similar consensuses which would impact upon the County. Deputy City Manager Reed said, "No," but that out-patient services handling had not been determined by the study committees.

Commissioner Richards expressed concern that the County had no participants on the various study teams. She felt that it would smooth the way considerably if the County had some input and understanding prior to the decision-making at City level.

Motion

After further discussion, Councilmember Cooke moved that the Council invite two members of the County Commissioners Court to be full participating voting members of Team #1. The motion, seconded by Councilmember Trevino, carried by a show of hands as follows:

Ayes: Mayor McClellan, Mayor Pro Tem Snell, Councilmembers
Cooke, Goodman, Himmelblau, Trevino
Noes: Councilmember Mullen

PLANNING CONTROLS IN E.T.J.

Commissioner Richards expressed concern over the City's policy of requiring that the County sign off on certain roads in the County before the City would hook up utilities to a piece of property. She felt that the County was being forced to accept substandard roads. She asked that the City alter its policy toward such roads.

Deputy City Manager Reed said that he was not aware of the problem, but would get a report.

CONCLUSIONS

City Manager Davidson stated that once the County and City decided which issues should be addressed, then he was prepared to offer full staff utilization and bring back a complete report.

Councilmember Cooke suggested that Mayor McClellan and Judge Renfro consider continued process on each item of discussion by follow-on meetings of the Council and Court and to use County and City staff to begin the preparation process of trying to bring some of the issues to a detailed fruition to allow analysis of alternatives as a collective group.

Commissioner Honts recommended that a Chairman from both City and County be appointed for each item.

Mayor McClellan suggested that further staff work be done on some items before going to an entire process committee.

Commissioner Moya suggested that some existing committees could handle some of the items and that Mayor McClellan and Judge Renfro could appoint others.

Mayor McClellan stated that she and Judge Renfro would get together to set a time for the next meeting. Immediate action would be taken on the City-County jail.

ADJOURNMENT

The meeting adjourned at 3:05 p.m.

APPROVED

Carole Keeton McClellan
Mayor

ATTEST:

Grace Monroe
City Clerk